



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,437	08/01/2003	Laurent Mollicone	MS303988.01	2858

22971 7590 09/10/2008
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/10/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/632,437	Applicant(s) MOLLICONE ET AL.	
	Examiner AMELIA RUTLEDGE	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/25/08; 3/14/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to: Amendment, filed 06/25/2008; Information Disclosure Statements, filed 06/25/2008 and 03/14/2008; RCE, filed 06/25/2008.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 20, and 24-26 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/25/2008 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is reminded that the information disclosure statements filed 02/05/2004 and 04/12/2004 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

The previous examiner listed the following documents as being cited in the above information disclosure statements but lacking copies in the application file (See Office Actions mailed 12/16/2005 and 06/01/2006), in particular the following documents:

- Musgrave, "Networking Technology... " cited in IDS of 4/12/04
- Chien, "Storing and Querying Multiversion XML Documents..." cited in IDS of 4/12/04
- "Netscape window" NETSCAPE SCREENSHOT, cited in IDS of 2/5/04
- Van Hoff, "The Open Software Description Format..." cited in IDS of 2/5/04
- NETSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS CORP., "SmartUpdate Developer's Guide." cited in IDS of 2/5/04
- Haukeland, "Tsbiff-tildeslash biff-- version 1.2.1" cited in IDS of 2/5/04

It appears that copies of the listed documents still have not been provided for the application file, and appear as not having been considered in the above information disclosure statements. Therefore, the above references will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 13-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley et al. ("Bradley"), U.S. Patent No. 7,313,757 B2, issued December 2007, Application No. 10/121,697 filed April 2002, in view of Maxwell et al. ("Maxwell"), U.S. Patent No. 6,589,290, issued July 2003, Application No. 09/430,535 filed October 1999.

Regarding independent claim 1, Bradley teaches *a method for upgrading documents for processing by processing functionality, comprising: inputting a structured document having particular data entry fields associated therewith into a particular version of the processing functionality*; because Bradley teaches a method of collecting user information by using an electronic form on a browser platform, which includes transforming a form template by sensing the characteristics of the browser platform and generating the form in a format suitable for presentation on the browser platform (col. 2, l. 60-col. 3, l. 60; col. 6, l. 15-55).

Bradley suggests *determining whether each of the particular data entry fields matches a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*;

modifying the particular data entry fields of the input structured document so that the particular data entry fields match the set of expected data entry fields to thereby provide a modified structured document;

because Bradley teaches transforming the form template into a presentation language that matches the target device, and teaches merging data with a form template to

render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30), compare to *a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*. Bradley teaches populating form fields with appropriate values (col. 14, l. 24-39).

Bradley suggests but does not explicitly teach *determining whether each of the particular data entry fields matches a set of expected data entry fields*, however Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61).

While Bradley suggests but does not explicitly teach *modifying the particular data entry fields of the input structured document so that the particular data entry fields match the set of expected data entry fields to thereby provide a modified structured document*; however Maxwell discloses matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields (col. 27-55), in a form by executing a data population command (col. 10, l. 36-59). Maxwell teaches matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of processing functionality, including various interfaces, application programming interfaces (API's), and browsers (col. 12, l. 2-18).

Bradley teaches *wherein said modifying occurs prior to transforming the structured document into another document suitable for presentation*, because Bradley teaches that the step of merging data with a form template to render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment, occurs prior to rendering the form on the browser (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30). Maxwell also teaches

that the modifying occurs prior to transforming the form into a form populated with data (Fig. 5).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Bradley teaches *transforming the modified structured document into another document suitable for presentation; displaying the other document suitable for presentation using the processing functionality to provide a displayed document; and editing the displayed document*, since Bradley discloses a method of offline form entry where the form, previously modified for device type, is transformed into an offline package for editing by a user (col. 25, l. 40-col. 26, l. 53).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Bradley teaches *wherein the input structured document is expressed in a markup language that uses tags pertaining to subject matter fields in the input structured document*, because Bradley teaches that the input document, i.e., form data file, is expressed in XML (col. 12, l. 65-col. 14, l. 45).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Bradley teaches *wherein the input structured document is expressed in the extensible markup language (XML)*, because Bradley teaches that the input document, i.e., form data file, is expressed in XML (col. 12, l. 65-col. 14, l. 45).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Bradley teaches *wherein the other document suitable for presentation is expressed in a markup language that uses tags pertaining to visual features associated with the presentation of the other document*, because Bradley teaches that the output form document is expressed in HTML (col. 6, L. 15-29; col. 16, L. 42-67).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Bradley teaches *wherein the other document suitable for presentation is expressed in the hypertext markup language (HTML)*, because Bradley teaches that the output form document is expressed in HTML (col. 6, L. 15-29; col. 16, L. 42-67).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Bradley teaches wherein the modifying uses an upgrade module that provides a transformation function using extensible stylesheet language (XSL), because Bradley teaches the use of XML templates (col. 12, l. 65-col. 14, l. 45).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Bradley teaches *wherein the other document suitable for presentation comprises an electronic form having at least one user data entry field therein*, because Bradley teaches outputting a form (col. 6, L. 15-29; col. 16, L. 42-67).

Regarding dependent claim 9, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the determining of whether each of the particular data entry fields matches a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality comprises:*

determining whether the input structured document contains each of the data entry fields expected by the particular version of the processing functionality, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 10, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the modifying of the particular data entry fields of the input structured document to produce the modified structured document comprises:*

creating each of the data entry fields expected by the particular version of the processing functionality to provide created data entry fields;

copying data entry fields content from the input structured document into corresponding created data entry fields in the modified structured document for those data entry fields in the input structured document that have counterpart data entry fields expected by the particular version of the processing functionality; and

creating default data entry fields content in corresponding data entry fields in the modified structured document for those created data entry fields that do not have counterpart data entry fields in the input structured document, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions and creating and copying the content into the expected data entry fields, (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61). Maxwell discloses matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields (col. 27-55), in a form by executing a data population command (col. 10, l. 36-59). Maxwell teaches matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of processing functionality, including various interfaces, application programming interfaces (API's), and browsers (col. 12, l. 2-18).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by

Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Bradley teaches *wherein the expected data entry fields are specified by a schema associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*, because Bradley teaches an XML template associated with the particular version of the processing functionality (col. 12, l. 65-col. 14, l. 45).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Bradley teaches *wherein the expected data entry fields are specified by some information other than a schema associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*, because Bradley teaches the use of scripting to add data access functionality to forms (col. 14, l. 24-39).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the input structured document corresponds to a markup language document generated by an earlier version of the processing functionality compared to the particular version*, however, Maxwell teaches inputting any version of the form, including the form version originally supplied to the target application (col. 12, l. 31-50). Maxwell teaches presenting the form in a manner associated with the target application (col. 11, l. 55-col. 12, l. 18).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser

Art Unit: 2176

platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the input structured document corresponds to a markup language document generated by a later version of the processing functionality compared to the particular version*, however, Maxwell teaches inputting any version of the form, including the form version originally supplied to the target application (col. 12, l. 31-50). Maxwell teaches presenting the form in a manner associated with the target application (col. 11, l. 55-col. 12, l. 18).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 17, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the modifying is performed using an upgrade module, and wherein the upgrade module is developed without knowledge of any requirements of any input structured document*, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61), and teaches that the module is developed without knowledge of any requirements of any input structured document, since Maxwell teaches creating an image of the input form, and then searching for a template file that resembles the form image (col. 12, l. 51-63).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 18, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein modifying of the particular data entry fields of the input structured document to produce the modified structured document comprises:*

creating new data entry fields in the modified structured document providing that the new data entry fields are lacking in the input structured document and providing that the new data entry fields are required in the particular version of the processing functionality, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61), and teaches creating new data entry fields in the modified form.

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 19, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein modifying of the particular data entry fields of the input structured document to produce the modified structured document comprises:*

omitting from the modified structured document existing data entry fields in the input structured document that are not required in the particular version of the processing functionality, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a

Art Unit: 2176

form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61), and teaches omitting data entry fields that are not required in the modified form.

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding independent claim 24, Bradley suggests *one or more computer readable media comprising: instructions that are executable to provide:*

an upgrade module configured to modify an input structured document having particular features associated therewith so that the input structured document conforms to a set of expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of the apparatus, to thereby produce a modified structured document; because Bradley teaches a method of collecting user information by using an electronic form on a browser platform, which includes transforming a form template by sensing the characteristics of the browser platform and generating the form in a format suitable for presentation on the browser platform (col. 2, l. 60-col. 3, l. 60; col. 6, l. 15-55).

Bradley does not explicitly teach *a set of expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of the apparatus*, however, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61). Maxwell discloses matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields (col. 27-55), in a form by executing a data population command (col. 10, l. 36-59). Maxwell teaches matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of processing functionality, including various interfaces, application programming interfaces (API's), and browsers (col. 12, l. 2-18).

Bradley teaches *a transformation module configured to transform the modified structured document into another document suitable for presentation after the structured document has been modified by the upgrade module*, because Bradley teaches that the step of merging data with a form template to render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment, occurs prior to rendering the form on the browser (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30). Maxwell also teaches that the modifying occurs prior to transforming the form into a form populated with data (Fig. 5).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same

application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding independent claim 25, Bradley teaches *one or more computer readable media comprising: instructions to: determine whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module*; because Bradley teaches a method of collecting user information by using an electronic form on a browser platform, which includes transforming a form template by sensing the characteristics of the browser platform and generating the form in a format suitable for presentation on the browser platform (col. 2, l. 60-col. 3, l. 60; col. 6, l. 15-55).

Bradley teaches and suggests *when the determination indicates that generation of the upgrade module is warranted, generate the upgrade module, wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular data entry fields associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*, because Bradley teaches transforming the form template into a presentation language that matches the target device, and teaches merging data with a form template to render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30). Bradley teaches populating form fields with appropriate values (col. 14, l. 24-39).

While Bradley does not explicitly teach *an updated document which conforms to a set of expected data entry fields*, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61). Maxwell discloses matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields (col. 27-55), in a form by executing a data population command (col. 10, l. 36-59). Maxwell teaches matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of processing functionality, including various interfaces, application programming interfaces (API's), and browsers (col. 12, l. 2-18).

Bradley teaches *wherein said modifying occurs prior to transforming the input structured document into another document suitable for presentation*, because Bradley teaches that the step of merging data with a form template to render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment, occurs prior to rendering the form on the browser (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30). Maxwell also teaches that the modifying occurs prior to transforming the form into a form populated with data (Fig. 5).

Both Bradley and Maxwell are directed to modifying forms using templates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of producing a form with templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, with the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same

application, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding independent claim 26, claim 26 is directed to substantially similar subject matter as claimed in independent claim 24, and is rejected along the same rationale.

4. Claims 11, 12, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradley in view of Maxwell, and further in view of Bradley, "The XML Companion, Third Edition", published by Addison Wesley Professional, December 12, 2001, downloaded from Safari Books Online, <http://proquest.safaribooksonline.com/021770598>, p. 1-18, ("XML Companion").

Regarding dependent claim 11, while Bradley in view of Maxwell does not explicitly teach *determining whether the input structured document lacks data entry fields that were previously classified as optional but are no longer classified as optional in the particular version of the processing functionality*, XML Companion teaches that XML Document type definitions (DTD) contained both required and optional elements which were indicated by the minimum number of occurrences, with optional elements designating zero or more occurrences in an output document and required elements designating one or more occurrences (p. 5-11). XML Companion discloses methods of using XSLT transformations to remove, create, reorder and sort element content, and to replace source elements with new output elements (p. 12-15), which would allow the

user to change a source optional element to be required in the output document. XML Companion discloses varying the output of an XSLT template depending on certain conditions, so that part of the formatting can be optional and only instantiated when a specific condition is true (p. 16-18). Therefore XML Companion teaches methods of determining the classification of optional or required elements, and creating new elements when required by a condition, such as a version of processing functionality.

XML Companion was a popular reference handbook for XML developers at the time of the invention, and thus designating and modifying required and optional XML elements would have been known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the methods of changing XML element designations disclosed by XML Companion, in order to convert documents from one model to another (XML Companion, p. 12, "Overview"), to the method of producing a form with XML templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, and the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, and since XML was a standard software language with detailed specifications, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 12, while Bradley in view of Maxwell does not explicitly teach *creating new data entry fields in the modified structured document*

providing that the new data entry fields are lacking in the input structured document and providing that the new data entry fields are required in the particular version of the processing functionality although considered optional by its schema, XML Companion teaches that XML Document type definitions (DTD) contained both required and optional elements which were indicated by the minimum number of occurrences, with optional elements designating zero or more occurrences in an output document and required elements designating one or more occurrences (p. 5-11). XML Companion discloses methods of using XSLT transformations to remove, create, reorder and sort element content, and to replace source elements with new output elements (p. 12-15), which would allow the user to change a source optional element to be required in the output document. XML Companion discloses varying the output of an XSLT template depending on certain conditions, so that part of the formatting can be optional and only instantiated when a specific condition is true (p. 16-18). Therefore XML Companion teaches methods of determining the classification of optional or required elements, and creating new elements when required by a condition, such as a version of processing functionality.

XML Companion was a popular reference handbook for XML developers at the time of the invention, and thus designating and modifying required and optional XML elements would have been known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the methods of changing XML element designations disclosed by XML Companion, in order to convert documents from one model to another (XML

Companion, p. 12, "Overview"), to the method of producing a form with XML templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, and the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, and since XML was a standard software language with detailed specifications, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding independent claim 20, Bradley teaches *a method for generating an upgrade module for upgrading documents for processing by processing functionality, comprising: determining whether a particular version of the processing functionality has been created that warrants generation of the upgrade module*; because Bradley teaches a method of collecting user information by using an electronic form on a browser platform, which includes transforming a form template by sensing the characteristics of the browser platform and generating the form in a format suitable for presentation on the browser platform (col. 2, l. 60-col. 3, l. 60; col. 6, l. 15-55).

Bradley suggests *when the determination indicates that generation of the upgrade module is warranted, generating the upgrade module, wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular data entry fields associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*; because Bradley teaches transforming the form template into a

presentation language that matches the target device, and teaches merging data with a form template to render the form in a format that best matches the browser and end user environment (col. 16, l. 35-col. 17, l. 30), compare to *a set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*. Bradley teaches populating form fields with appropriate values (col. 14, l. 24-39).

Bradley suggests but does not explicitly teach *wherein the upgrade module is configured to modify an input structured document having particular data entry fields associated therewith to create an updated document which conforms to a set of expected data entry fields*; however, Maxwell discloses matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields (col. 27-55), in a form by executing a data population command (col. 10, l. 36-59). Maxwell teaches matching data entry fields to expected data entry fields associated with a particular version of processing functionality, including various interfaces, application programming interfaces (API's), and browsers (col. 12, l. 2-18). Maxwell teaches modifying the input form to create an updated form which conforms to a set of expected data entry fields (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61).

Bradley in view of Maxwell does not explicitly teach *wherein said modifying includes creating new data entry fields in the updated document provided that the new data entry fields are required in the particular version of the processing functionality even if the new data entry fields are considered optional by its schema*. However, XML Companion teaches that XML Document type definitions (DTD) contained both required and optional elements which were indicated by the minimum number of occurrences, with optional elements designating zero or more occurrences in an output document

and required elements designating one or more occurrences (p. 5-11). XML Companion discloses methods of using XSLT transformations to remove, create, reorder and sort element content, and to replace source elements with new output elements (p. 12-15), which would allow the user to change a source optional element to be required in the output document. XML Companion discloses varying the output of an XSLT template depending on certain conditions, so that part of the formatting can be optional and only instantiated when a specific condition is true (p. 16-18). Therefore XML Companion teaches methods of determining the classification of optional or required elements, and creating new elements when required by a condition, such as a version of processing functionality.

XML Companion was a popular reference handbook for XML developers at the time of the invention, and thus designating and modifying required and optional XML elements would have been known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the methods of changing XML element designations disclosed by XML Companion, in order to convert documents from one model to another (XML Companion, p. 12, "Overview"), to the method of producing a form with XML templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, and the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, and since XML was a standard software language with detailed specifications, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Bradley teaches wherein the modifying uses an upgrade module that provides a transformation function using extensible stylesheet language (XSL), because Bradley teaches the use of XML templates (col. 12, l. 65-col. 14, l. 45).

Regarding dependent claim 22, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the update module is configured to create new data entry fields in the input structured document such that the updated document conforms to the set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61), and teaches creating new data entry fields in the modified form.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the methods of changing XML element designations disclosed by XML Companion, in order to convert documents from one model to another (XML Companion, p. 12, "Overview"), to the method of producing a form with XML templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, and the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, and since XML was a standard software language with detailed specifications, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Regarding dependent claim 23, while Bradley does not explicitly teach *wherein the update module is configured to omit data entry fields in the input structured document from updated document such that the updated document conforms to the set of expected data entry fields associated with the particular version of the processing functionality*, Maxwell teaches determining whether data entry fields of a form match the set of expected data entry fields in a template file containing one or more form descriptions (col. 12, l. 19-col. 14, l. 61), and teaches omitting data entry fields that are not required in the modified form.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the methods of changing XML element designations disclosed by XML Companion, in order to convert documents from one model to another (XML Companion, p. 12, "Overview"), to the method of producing a form with XML templates adapted to different browser platforms disclosed by Bradley, and the method of populating a form with data entry fields from a template file disclosed by Maxwell, since the templates disclosed by Bradley and Maxwell could both be applied to the same form and used in the same application, and since XML was a standard software language with detailed specifications, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new grounds of rejection includes the Bradley and Maxwell patents, which are relied upon to teach the newly claimed limitations of independent claims 1, 20, and 24-26, which replace the term "editing controls" with "data entry fields".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMELIA RUTLEDGE whose telephone number is (571)272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 2176

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amelia Rutledge/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176